

## **REMARKS**

**[0001]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 11-19, 22-35 are presently pending. Claim amended herein is 29. No new claims have been added herein.

## **Substantive Matters**

### **Claim Rejections under § 112**

**[0002]** The Office rejected claims 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Based upon the amendment herein, the Applicant submits that this rejection is no longer applicable. Specifically, a term “in-band or out-of-band” is added before “tuners” in claim 29. Support can be found from Paragraphs [0064] and [0092] of Applicant’s disclosure.

### **Claim Rejections under § 103**

**[0003]** In addition, the Office rejects claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 11, 15-19, 22, and 25-35 under §103. For the reasons set forth below, the Office has not made a prima facie case showing that the rejected claims are obvious.

**[0004]** Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0005] The Office's rejections are based upon the following references alone and in combination:

- **Zaslavsky:** *Zaslavsky et al.*, US Patent Publication No. 2003/0014752 A1 (published date January 16, 2003);
- **Gordon:** *Gordon, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,481,012 B1 (issued November 12, 2002);
- **Norsworthy:** *Norsworthy et al.*, US Patent No. 6,784,945 B2 (issued August 31, 2004); and
- **Dawson:** *Dawson et al.*, US Patent Publication No. 2004/0184523 A1 (published date September 23, 2004).

### **Overview of the Application**

[0006] The Application describes a technology for facilitating a presentation of multiple miniaturized video feeds to a multimedia receiver. It further facilitates a user-interface employing multiple miniaturized video feeds to a multimedia receiver.

## **Cited References**

**[0007]** The Office cites Zaslavsky as the primary reference in the obviousness-based rejections. The Office cites Norsworthy, Gordon, and Dawson as secondary references in the obviousness-based rejections.

### **Zaslavsky**

**[0008]** Zaslavsky describes a method for operating a decoder. The method comprises receiving, on a first channel, an electronic program guide data stream comprising multiple video streams which have been encoded and multiplexed for transmission on the first channel, each video stream comprising a low resolution version of a high resolution video stream which is being simultaneously received on a separate channel; decoding the electronic program guide data stream into frames, each frame defining a mosaic-style image comprising image areas for images in the electronic program guide data stream corresponding to images from each of the multiple video streams; and displaying each of the frames on a display screen coupled to the decoder.

### **Norsworthy**

**[0009]** Norsworthy describes multiple information decoding system and method in which multiple information content is decoded sequentially and provided to a viewer such that the viewer perceives the information content as being simultaneously decoded. One embodiment of the system and method is in

a video display system where RF channels are decoded by a single tuner for concurrent presentation to a display.

*Gordon*

**[0010]** Gordon describes a method for slice-based encoding of program guides and user interfaces. The program guides include multiple video streams for picture-in-picture and other applications. A method for encoding the program guide includes encoding a first set of slices for each of a plurality of graphics pages; and encoding a second set of slices for each of a plurality of video streams. The user interfaces are multi-functional and may be used for electronic commerce and other applications. A method of generating the user interface includes encoding a set of slices for each of a plurality of objects, each object being characterized by an identity, at least one attribute, and at least one operation.

*Dawson*

**[0011]** Dawson describes a method and system for providing reduced network bandwidth for picture in picture (PIP) video transmission. The method includes receiving a request signal from a client display to scale a video signal, a server scaling an auxiliary video signal from which pictures presented in an auxiliary display of a client display are derived and the server encoding signals from which pictures presented in a main display and an auxiliary display of said display are derived. Further, the method includes combining the signals from

which pictures presented in the main display and the auxiliary display are derived and the server transmitting to the client display combined signals from which pictures presented in the main display and the auxiliary display are derived. The client then displays the main image and the PIP image.

## **Obviousness Rejections**

### **Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)**

[0012] Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office's obviousness rejections. Discussions presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a *prima facie* case have not been met.

### **Based upon Zaslavsky and Dawson**

[0013] The Office rejects claims 31, 34 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaslavsky in view of Dawson. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Office to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

#### **Independent Claim 31**

[0014] Independent claim 31 recites production of a "a user-interface (UI) of a multimedia system, the UI comprising multiple "thumbnail" display areas, each area configured to display a reduced-scale ("thumbnail") video feed received, in response to a request for the thumbnail video feed of each area, via a communications network."

[0015] Applicant submits that Zaslavsky and Dawson (either alone or in combination) do not disclose, teach or suggest at least the following feature, as recited in this claim:

- in response to a request for the thumbnail video feed of each area, via a communications network

[0016] The Office admits that Zaslavsky does not teach that the request for displaying is received via a communications network, and thus relies upon Dawson to teach the claimed feature above. However, Dawson merely describes downsizing an auxiliary video upon receiving a request. Nowhere does Dawson disclose or teach a request for downsizing multiple videos. Specifically, nowhere in Dawson is there any disclosure or teaching of “in response to *a request for the thumbnail video feed of each area, via a communications network*” as recited in claim 31. (Emphasis added.) For at least this reason alone, claim 31 is allowable.

[0017] The Office indicates (Action, p. 9) the following with regard to this claim:

“It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Zaslavsky so that the reduced-scale video streams were transmitted to the user over a communications network in response to a user request, as taught by Dawson, in order to eliminate the scaling requirement of the client display device (as Dawson discusses in Paragraphs [0002-0008]; with further reference to Paragraph [0050]).”

[0018] Applicant, however, respectfully submits that the stated motivation “in order to eliminate the scaling requirement of the client display device” indicated by the Office is not valid. Zaslavsky describes providing small thumbnail videos of low resolution over a separate preview channel (see Paragraphs [0119] and [0128-132]) before transmission. More specifically, Zaslavsky discloses downsizing videos into small thumbnail videos of low

resolution at the head end before transmission (see Paragraphs [0127] and [0142]). This is similar to the teachings of Dawson for eliminating “the scaling requirement of the client display device.” It is therefore seemingly unclear why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have motivated to combine the teachings of Zaslavsky and Dawson because Zaslavsky has already solved the same problem identified by Dawson in essentially the same way. For this additional reason, claim 31 is allowable.

**[0019]** Furthermore, Zaslavsky teaches transmitting thumbnail videos of a standard set of channels in a single stream, with the single stream being written to a texture map 1001 upon receiving on the client end (see Paragraphs [0127] and [0138] of Zaslavsky). Out of the texture map 1001, a user selects or requests certain channels (i.e., thumbnail videos of certain channels) for displaying in a selection block 803. Specifically, a user request in Zaslavsky is a request for selecting already downsized thumbnail videos from the texture map 1001 to the selection block 803 for display. However, a user request in Dawson is a request for downsizing a video possibly of full-resolution version (see Paragraph [0004] of Dawson) on an auxiliary display which is similar to the selection block 803 of Zaslavsky (see Paragraphs [0006], [0027] and [0032] of Dawson, for example). Therefore, not only are the requests in Zaslavsky and Dawson totally different, it is seemingly unclear for one of ordinary skill in the art how and why already downsized thumbnail videos in the selection block 803 are *selectively* requested for further downsizing should Zaslavsky and Dawson have been combined. For at least this reason alone, claim 31 is allowable over the cited references.

**[0020]** As shown above, either the combination of Zaslavsky and Dawson does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the claimed elements and features of this claim, or they should not be combined. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

**Dependent Claims 34 and 35**

**[0021]** These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 31 previously listed. As discussed above, independent claim 31 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

**Based upon Zaslavsky, Norsworthy and Dawson**

**[0022]** The Office rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 15-19, 22, 25-30, 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaslavsky in view of Norsworthy, and further in view of Dawson. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Office to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

*Independent Claim 1*

[0023] Independent claim 1 recites, in part, the following:

- reducing the scale of a video feed to produce its "thumbnail" video feed;
- receiving a request for a plurality of the thumbnail video feeds;
- in response to the request, concurrently transmitting the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over a communications network; and
- transmitting a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over the communications network."

[0024] Applicant submits that Zaslavsky and Dawson (either alone or in combination) do not disclose, teach or suggest at least the following features, as recited in this claim:

- receiving a request for a plurality of the thumbnail video feeds
- in response to the request, concurrently transmitting the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over a communications network

[0025] The Office admits that Zaslavsky does not teach that the request for displaying is received via a communications network, and thus relies upon Dawson to teach the claimed feature above. However, Dawson merely describes downsizing an auxiliary video upon receiving a request. Nowhere does Dawson disclose or teach a request for downsizing *multiple* videos. Specifically, nowhere in Dawson is there any disclosure or teaching of "*receiving a request for a*

*plurality of the thumbnail video feeds*" as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added.) For at least this reason alone, claim 1 is therefore allowable.

**[0026]** The Office indicates (Action, p. 12) the following with regard to the current claim:

"It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Zaslavsky so that the reduced-scale video streams were transmitted to the user over a communication network in response to a user request, as taught by Dawson, in order to eliminate the scaling requirement of the client display device (as Dawson discusses in Paragraph [0002-0008]; with further reference to Paragraph [0050])."

**[0027]** Applicant, however, respectfully submits that the stated motivation "in order to eliminate the scaling requirement of the client display device" indicated by the Office is not valid. Zaslavsky describes providing small thumbnail videos of low resolution over a separate preview channel (see Paragraphs [0119] and [0128-132]) before transmission. More specifically, Zaslavsky discloses downsizing videos into small thumbnail videos of low resolution at the head end before transmission (see Paragraphs [0127] and [0142]). This is similar to the teachings of Dawson for eliminating "the scaling requirement of the client display device." It is therefore seemingly unclear why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have motivated to combine the teachings of Zaslavsky and Dawson because Zaslavsky has already solved the same problem identified by Dawson in essentially the same way. For this additional reason, claim 1 is allowable.

**[0028]** Furthermore, Zaslavsky teaches transmitting thumbnail videos of a standard set of channels in a single stream, with the single stream being written

to a texture map 1001 upon receiving on the client end (see Paragraphs [0127] and [0138] of Zaslavsky). Out of the texture map 1001, a user selects or requests certain channels (i.e., thumbnail videos of certain channels) for displaying in a selection block 803. Specifically, a user request in Zaslavsky is a request for selecting already downsized thumbnail videos from the texture map 1001 to the selection block 803 for display. However, a user request in Dawson is a request for downsizing a video possibly of full-resolution version (see Paragraph [0004] of Dawson) on an auxiliary display which is similar to the selection block 803 of Zaslavsky (see Paragraphs [0006], [0027] and [0032] of Dawson, for example). Therefore, not only are the requests in Zaslavsky and Dawson totally different, it is seemingly unclear for one of ordinary skill in the art how and why already downsized thumbnail videos in the selection block 803 are *selectively* requested for further downsizing should Zaslavsky and Dawson have been combined. For at least this reason alone, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

**[0029]** Moreover, Applicant submits that Zaslavsky and Norsworthy (either alone or in combination) do not disclose, teach or suggest at least the following feature as recited in this claim:

- transmitting a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over the communications network

**[0030]** The Examiner admits that the combination of Zaslavsky and Dawson does not teach “transmitting a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over the communication network” as

recited in claim 1. The Examiner thus relies upon Norsworthy and asserts that Norsworthy teaches the claimed features above. The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 12) the following with regards to this claim:

"In a similar field of invention, Norsworthy teaches a method for generating, distributing, and receiving a transport stream containing compressed video and graphics information. Norsworthy's method further comprises the construction and display of an Electronic Program Guide (Fig. 7) that includes informational displays 71-74 and signals 701-704 (as disclosed in Col. 6 Lines 8-14). Norsworthy further teaches transmitting audio and video signals in separate streams, as received by Tuner 11 for PIP video and Tuner 91 for audio, as shown in Fig. 9 and described Col. 4 Lines 59-62; with further reference to Col. 3 Lines 27-55."

**[0031]** Applicant, however, respectfully submits that Norsworthy does not teach or suggest this feature.

**[0032]** Col. 3 Lines 27-55 of Norsworthy merely shows that if a single tuner is used, audio signal would be lost because of interleaving effect. Norsworthy therefore discloses that "in situations where it is desired, for example, in a television system to have the audio continuously available on the main channel, the circuitry system and method of Fig. 3 would be utilized where main tuner 31 will tune a single channel as set forth in the prior art system of Fig. 6, while tuner 11 will handle multiple PIP pictures for display as shown in Fig. 2." Description of the main tuner 31 of Fig. 6, which is given in Col. 3 Lines 11-26, is partly excerpted below:

"In FIG. 6, *main tuner 31 decodes the RF signal* from the television antenna or cable and provides it to demodulator 32 which then provides a signal to decoder 33 for subsequent video processing by video processor 15 *for display on CRT 50, as main picture 51, FIG. 5. ... Audio is only available on the primary picture 51*

but the user may interchange the two channels anytime the user wishes to do so." (Emphasis added.)

**[0033]** As illustrated in Fig. 6 of Norsworthy and the above excerpt, the main tuner 31 receives a RF signal which is then provided to a demodulator 32 for obtaining video and audio signals. Neither the cited portion (i.e., Col. 3 Lines 27-55 of Norsworthy), nor Fig. 6 of Norsworthy, however, discloses or teaches "transmitting a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over the communication network" as recited in claim 1.

**[0034]** Moreover, Fig. 9 and Col. 4 Lines 59-62 of Norsworthy, which are currently cited by the Office, simply describe that a separate audio tuner is used to provide audio signal. The cited portions, however, are silent as to "transmitting a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over the communication network" as recited in claim 1. More specifically, Fig. 9, together with the description in Col. 4 Lines 59-92, simply disclose how "audio is provided by a separate tuner (tuner 91)", *but not how audio is transmitted*. It is possible that a single signal having both audio and video parts is transmitted, and the audio tuner (tuner 91) is used for picking up the audio part from the single signal. Indeed, this latter transmission method for audio and video signals is in better agreement with the disclosure of Norsworthy.

**[0035]** Col. 3 Line 66 to Col. 4 Line 5, which is the only part in Norsworthy's disclosure with a description of a transmission method for audio and video signals, is excerpted below:

"A channel is typically composed of video and audio. The audio could be either analog or digital, and the system could be a digital system as well where the

base band would be a bit stream. In an analog system, such as we are discussing here, the demodulator takes the **IF**, down converts **it** to base band so as to produce **two outputs**, a based band composite **video signal** and a based band composite **audio signal**, ..." (Emphasis added.)

[0036] This excerpt shows that audio and video signals are bundled together as an IF signal before transmission. Other than this excerpt, nowhere in Norsworthy is there any disclosure or teaching of another transmission method. Without the benefit of the Applicant's disclosure, it is therefore seemingly unclear how the Office reaches the assertion that Norsworthy teaches transmitting audio and video signals in separate streams.

[0037] Furthermore, a preferred embodiment of Norsworthy, as described in Fig. 3 and Col. 4 Lines 49-58, show that audio and video signals are bundled together in a single signal for transmission (see the use of IF and demodulator in Fig. 3, and the descriptions of IF and demodulator in Col. 4 Lines 3-5, for example). Should the transmission method for audio and video signals be different in the embodiment cited by the Office and described in Fig. 9 and Col. 4 Lines 59-62 (paragraph immediately following the description of the preferred embodiment) of Norsworthy, it would be more reasonable to see an explicit statement/description of a change in the transmission method. However, Norsworthy is silent as to describing any change in the transmission method. It therefore seems to be more reasonable and natural for one of ordinary skill in the art to assume that the transmission method of audio and video signals is the same in both embodiments of Norsworthy.

[0038] As shown above, either the combination of Zaslavsky, Norsworthy and Dawson does not teach, suggest or disclose all of the claimed elements and

features of this claim, or they should not be combined. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

*Dependent Claims 3 and 4*

**[0039]** These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 1 previously listed. As discussed above, independent claim 1 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

*Independent Claim 5*

**[0040]** Independent claim 5 recites a method comprising:

- reducing the scale of a video feed to produce its "thumbnail" video feed;
- receiving a request for a plurality of the thumbnail video feeds;
- in response to the request, concurrently transmitting the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over a communications network; and
- transmitting a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over the communications network.

**[0041]** Applicant submits that Zaslavsky, Dawson, and Norsworthy (either alone or in combination) do not disclose, teach or suggest at least the following features, as recited in this claim:

- receiving a request for a plurality of the thumbnail video feeds
- in response to the request, concurrently transmitting the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over a communications network
- transmitting a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over the communications network

**[0042]** As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Dawson merely describes a request for downsizing an auxiliary signal. Dawson, however, fails to disclose or teach "*receiving a request for a plurality of the thumbnail video feeds*" and "*in response to the request, concurrently transmitting the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over a communications network*" as recited in this claim.

**[0043]** Furthermore, the allegedly motivation cited by the Office is not valid because Zaslavsky has already taught downsizing the videos before transmission, which is similar to the teachings of Dawson for "eliminating the scaling requirement of the client display device." Moreover, it is seemingly unclear for one of ordinary skill in the art how and why already downsized thumbnail videos in the selection block 803 are *selectively* requested for further downsizing should Zaslavsky and Dawson have been combined.

**[0044]** In addition, Norsworthy is silent as to "*transmitting a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds* over the communications network" as recited in claim 5. Indeed, Norsworthy discloses that video and audio signals are first bundled together into a single signal before transmission.

**[0045]** For more detailed explanations about why the cited references do not disclose or teach the above claimed features, or why the cited references should not be combined, Applicant respectfully refers the Office to Paragraphs [0023] – [0038] of this Response for similar discussions with respect to independent claim 1.

**[0046]** For at least the above reasons, claim 5 is therefore allowable. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

*Dependent Claim 7*

**[0047]** This claim ultimately depends upon the independent claim 5 previously listed. As discussed above, independent claim 5 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

*Independent Claim 8*

**[0048]** Independent claim 8 recites:

- in response to a request, concurrently receiving a plurality of scale-reduced versions of video feeds ("thumbnail video feeds") over a communication network;
- receiving a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of thumbnail video feeds;

- constructing and presenting a user-interface (UI) comprising the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds; and
- presenting audio that corresponds to one of the plurality of the presented thumbnail video feeds.

**[0049]** Applicant submits that Zaslavsky, Dawson, and Norsworthy (either alone or in combination) do not disclose, teach or suggest at least the following features, as recited in this claim:

- in response to a request, concurrently receiving a plurality of scale-reduced versions of video feeds ("thumbnail video feeds") over a communication network
- receiving a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of thumbnail video feeds

**[0050]** As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Dawson merely describes a request for downsizing an auxiliary signal. Dawson, however, fails to disclose or teach "*in response to a request, concurrently receiving a plurality of scale-reduced versions of video feeds ("thumbnail video feeds") over a communication network*" as recited in this claim.

**[0051]** Furthermore, the allegedly motivation cited by the Office is not valid because Zaslavsky has already taught downsizing the videos before transmission, which is similar to the teachings of Dawson for "eliminating the scaling requirement of the client display device." Moreover, it is seemingly unclear for one of ordinary skill in the art how and why already downsized thumbnail videos

in the selection block 803 are *selectively* requested for further downsizing should Zaslavsky and Dawson have been combined.

**[0052]** In addition, Norsworthy is silent as to "*receiving a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of thumbnail video feeds*" as recited in claim 8. Indeed, Norsworthy discloses that video and audio signals are first bundled together into a single signal before transmission.

**[0053]** For more detailed explanations about why the cited references do not disclose or teach the above claimed features, or why the cited references should not be combined, Applicant respectfully refers the Office to Paragraphs [0023] – [0038] of this Response for similar discussions with respect to independent claim 1.

**[0054]** For at least the above reasons, claim 8 is therefore allowable. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

#### Dependent Claims 11 and 15-18

**[0055]** These claims ultimately depend upon the independent claim 8 previously listed. As discussed above, independent claim 8 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent Claims 19

[0056] Independent claim 19 recites a method facilitating production of a user-interface (UI), the method comprising:

- in response to a request, concurrently receiving a plurality of scale-reduced versions of video feeds ("thumbnail video feeds") over a communication network;
- receiving a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of thumbnail video feeds;
- constructing and presenting a user-interface (UI) comprising the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds; and
- presenting audio that corresponds to one of the plurality of the presented thumbnail video feeds.

[0057] Applicant submits that Zaslavsky, Dawson, and Norsworthy (either alone or in combination) do not disclose, teach or suggest at least the following features, as recited in this claim:

- in response to a request, concurrently receiving a plurality of scale-reduced versions of video feeds ("thumbnail video feeds") over a communication network
- receiving a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of thumbnail video feeds

[0058] As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Dawson merely describes a request for downsizing an auxiliary signal. Dawson, however, fails to disclose or teach "*in response to a request, concurrently receiving a plurality of*

*scale-reduced versions of video feeds ("thumbnail video feeds") over a communication network" as recited in this claim.*

[0059] Furthermore, the allegedly motivation cited by the Office is not valid because Zaslavsky has already taught downsizing the videos before transmission, which is similar to the teachings of Dawson for "eliminating the scaling requirement of the client display device." Moreover, it is seemingly unclear for one of ordinary skill in the art how and why already downsized thumbnail videos in the selection block 803 are *selectively* requested for further downsizing should Zaslavsky and Dawson have been combined.

[0060] In addition, Norsworthy is silent as to "*receiving a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of thumbnail video feeds*" as recited in claim 19. Indeed, Norsworthy discloses that video and audio signals are first bundled together into a single signal before transmission.

[0061] For more detailed explanations about why the cited references do not disclose or teach the above claimed features, or why the cited references should not be combined, Applicant respectfully refers the Office to Paragraphs [0023] – [0038] of this Response for similar discussions with respect to independent claim 1.

[0062] For at least the above reasons, claim 19 is therefore allowable. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 22 and 25-28

[0063] These claims ultimately depend upon the independent claim 19 previously listed. As discussed above, independent claim 19 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent Claim 29

[0064] Independent claim 29 recites a multimedia system comprising:

- a receiving unit configured for concurrently receiving, without any in-band or out-of-band tuners and in response to a request, a plurality of scaled-reduced video feeds ("thumbnail video feeds") and a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over a communication network;
- a user-interface (UI) generator configured to generate a UI comprising the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds;
- a presentation device configured for presentation of the UI and audio that corresponds to one of the plurality of the presented thumbnail video feeds,
- wherein:
  - the receiving unit is further configured with an upper limit of total bandwidth that is available via the communication network,

- each thumbnail video feed of the plurality of thumbnail video feeds has a bit-rate property, and
- the cardinality of the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds received by the receiving unit being bound by the upper limit of total bandwidth that is available via the communication network and the bit-rate properties of the plurality of thumbnail video feeds received by the receiving unit.

**[0065]** Applicant submits that Zaslavsky, Dawson, and Norsworthy (either alone or in combination) do not disclose, teach or suggest at least the following features, as recited in this claim:

- a receiving unit configured for concurrently receiving, without any in-band or out-of-band tuners and in response to a request, a plurality of scaled-reduced video feeds ("thumbnail video feeds") and a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over a communication network

**[0066]** As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Dawson merely describes a request for downsizing an auxiliary signal. Dawson, however, fails to disclose or teach "*concurrently receiving, ... in response to a request, a plurality of scaled-reduced video feeds ("thumbnail video feeds") and a plurality of audio feeds*" as recited in this claim.

**[0067]** Furthermore, the allegedly motivation cited by the Office is not valid because Zaslavsky has already taught downsizing the videos before transmission,

which is similar to the teachings of Dawson for "eliminating the scaling requirement of the client display device." Moreover, it is seemingly unclear for one of ordinary skill in the art how and why already downsized thumbnail videos in the selection block 803 are *selectively* requested for further downsizing should Zaslavsky and Dawson have been combined.

**[0068]** In addition, Norsworthy is silent as to "*concurrently receiving, ... a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over a communication network*" as recited in claim 29. Indeed, Norsworthy discloses that video and audio signals are first bundled together into a single signal before transmission.

**[0069]** Furthermore, the cited combination fails to disclose or teach "*concurrently receiving, without any in-band or out-of-band tuners and in response to a request, a plurality of scaled-reduced video feeds ("thumbnail video feeds") and a plurality of audio feeds separately from the plurality of the thumbnail video feeds over a communication network*" as recited in this claim.

**[0070]** For more detailed explanations about why the cited references do not disclose or teach the above claimed features, or why the cited references should not be combined, Applicant respectfully refers the Office to Paragraphs [0023] – [0038] of this Response for similar discussions with respect to independent claim 1.

**[0071]** For at least the above reasons, claim 29 is therefore allowable. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claim 30

[0072] This claim ultimately depends upon the independent claim 29 previously listed. As discussed above, independent claims 29 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Dependent Claims 32 and 33

[0073] These claims ultimately depend upon the independent claim 31 previously listed. As discussed above, independent claims 31 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

**Based upon Zaslavsky, Dawson, Norsworthy and Gordon**

[0074] The Office rejects claims 12, 13, 14, 23, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaslavsky, Dawson, and Norsworthy as applied to Claims 8 and 19 above, and in further view of Gordon. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Office to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Dependent Claims 12-14, 23 and 24

[0075] Applicant submits that the combination of Zaslavsky, Norsworthy, Dawson and Gordon does not disclose, teach or suggest all of the features as recited in dependent claims 12-14, 23 and 24 (with emphasis added):

- *zooming* the select one of the plurality of the presented thumbnail video feeds so that the select one inhabits much or all of the available screen space

[0076] The Office admits that Zaslavsky does not teach “zooming the select one of the plurality of the presented thumbnail video feeds so that the select one inhabits much or all of the available screen space”. The Office thus relies upon Gordon to teach the above claimed feature. The Office indicates (Action, p. 31) the following with regard to these claims:

“In a similar field of invention, Gordon teaches a method for generating, distributing, and receiving a transport stream containing compressed video and graphics information. Gordon’s method further comprises “interacting with an object by selecting it to activate a full-resolution broadcast channel” (as disclosed in Col. 24 Lines 11-14; with further reference to Fig. 23 and Col. 22 Lines 1-19). Following the selection in the thumbnail view (shown as CH-E of Fig. 28), the display changes to a full-resolution view (display 2802 of Fig. 28; with further reference to Fig. 23 and Col. 22 Lines 1-19) of the video broadcast for channel E (as discussed in Col. 24 Lines 14-19). In addition, Gordon demonstrates a “zooming” action when switching from the thumbnail display of CH-E to FULL-RESOLUTION CH-E 2802, as shown in Fig. 28.”

**[0077]** Applicant, however, submits that Gordon does not disclose, teach or suggest “zooming the select one of the plurality of the presented thumbnail video feeds so that the select one inhabits much or all of the available screen space”. Instead, the cited portions of Gordon merely describe the display being changed to a full-resolution view following a selection in corresponding thumbnail view. Nowhere in the cited paragraphs or elsewhere in Gordon is there any disclosure of the act of “zooming”. Also, Fig. 28 merely shows that a full-resolution view will be displayed following a selection. No zooming action is taught or suggested in the cited figure.

**[0078]** As shown above, the combination of Zaslavsky, Norsworthy, Dawson and Gordon does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of these claims. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

### **Dependent Claims**

**[0079]** In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Office withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

## **Conclusion**

[0080] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Office is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call/email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 3/17/2009 \_\_\_\_\_ By: /kaseychristie40559/ \_\_\_\_\_

Kasey C. Christie  
Reg. No. 40559  
(509) 324-9256 x 4732  
[kasey@leehayes.com](mailto:kasey@leehayes.com)  
[www.leehayes.com](http://www.leehayes.com)